

May 4, 2005

Dear Superintendent,

Attached is the Annual Reading Proficiency Report in compliance with SB230 (2004 legislative session). **All reports are due on May 25, 2005** to:

Utah State Office of Education
Curriculum Department/Lynne Greenwood
250 East 500 South
PO Box 144200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4200
or
e-mail: lgreenwo@usoe.k12.ut.us

Draft

If you are using the Utah Elementary Language Arts Criterion Reference Tests (CRTs), please fill out a partial report without completing the proficiency data column for 2005. When you receive your CRT data in August, re-submit the report providing your data from your CRT results. If you are revising your literacy plan, please submit your new plan by the end of September or before.

We are also asking you to summarize your program investment (how your legislative funding has been utilized), what activities you have sponsored to support your program investment, what your program outputs are, and what your 2005 program outcomes are as a result of the legislative funding. This summary should provide a line of evidence regarding your current utilization of funding to accomplish your program goal(s).

We hope you will also share your Annual Reading Proficiency Report with teachers, parents, PTA, community leaders, and especially with area legislators. Individual communities need to be informed of your great efforts and wise financial use of resources to improve reading proficiency within your district.

cc: District Curriculum Director
District Literacy Director

Annual Reading Proficiency Report

As Determined by District Gain/Growth Scores

Supporting SB230

District _____

Literacy Director _____

Date: _____

Annual improvements in reading proficiency were determined by the following procedure:

_____ ☐ We will be submitting a new literacy plan on or before September 2005.

☐ We will **not** be submitting a new literacy plan on or before September 2005.

Grade Level Targeted Standards (PA, P, F, V, C)	Assessment(s) Used to Measure Gains and/or Growth in Reading Proficiency	Baseline Proficiency Data 2004	Proficiency Data 2005	Goal Met Y/N	Proficiency Data 2006	Goal Met Y/N	Proficiency Data 2007	Goal Met Y/N
K								
1								
2								
3								
(Optional Grades) 4								
5								
6								

Note: If proficiency goals are not met, you must attach a revised reading plan to address needed instructional changes.

Please summarize your 2004-5 funded program investments, program building activities, program outputs, and achieved program outcomes for improving reading proficiency.

District: _____

District Literacy Director:_____

Inputs—Program Investments:	Outputs—Program Building Activities:	Program Outputs:
		Program Outcomes: Short Term:
		Medium Term:
		Long Term:

Please summarize your 2004-5 funded program investments, program building activities, program outputs, and achieved program outcomes for improving reading proficiency.

District: Happy Valley

Literacy Director: Bess Reading

Inputs–Program Investments:

1. Legislative funding was utilized to hire 5 literacy coaches for our most at-risk elementary schools.
2. Legislative funding provided professional development for 5 literacy coaches and 5 previously hired coaches.
3. Legislative funding provided professional development support for teachers working with school literacy coaches.

sample document

Outputs–Program Building Activities:

1. Literacy coaches received USOE training on the essential practices for successful school literacy coaching.
2. The district provided training for coaches and grade-level teacher representatives on DIBELS and TPRI assessments.
3. Quarterly substitutes were provided for teachers in grades k-3 to review student assessment data with school literacy coaches. Appropriate instructional practices and interventions were planned and implemented to support the needs of struggling readers.
4. Coaches were trained on observing Tier I instruction and successfully implementing needed SBRR practices utilizing the Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum to prevent reading failure.

Program Outputs:

1. Ten literacy coaches are trained on essential coaching practices.
2. Ten coaches and forty teachers are proficient in administering and interpreting the DIBELS and TPRI assessments.
3. Ten coaches and 120 teachers are trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers.
4. Nine coaches can adequately observe classroom instruction and work cooperatively with teachers in implementing improved instructional practices utilizing the core curriculum to prevent reading failure.

Program Outcomes:

Short Term:

1. 300 students received a program review to improve reading proficiency.
2. 200 students received Tier II intervention to improve literacy proficiency.

Medium Term: All first–third grade level Language Arts CRT scores improved. 95 % of all kindergarten students met proficiency on letter naming fluency and phoneme segmentation as measured by DIBELS.

Long Term: 80% of all students in grades k-3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS in kindergarten and the Utah Elementary Language Arts CRTs in grades 1-3.

